

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	CRIMINAL NO. 09-40040-2-GPM
)	
BECKY D. MORGAN,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

MURPHY, District Judge:

This matter is before the Court on a pro se motion brought by Defendant Becky D. Morgan (Doc. 91). In reality the so-called motion is a letter by Morgan dated May 26, 2010, and addressed to United States Magistrate Judge Philip M. Frazier that was erroneously entered on the docket in this case. As a general rule, of course, courts should not entertain pro se submissions by parties who are represented by counsel. *See Cain v. Peters*, 972 F.2d 748, 750 (7th Cir. 1992) (“Representation by counsel and self-representation are mutually exclusive[.]”). This is because of the confusion and waste of judicial resources entailed in allowing a party represented by counsel also to represent himself or herself pro se. *See United States v. Orey*, 263 F.3d 669, 673 (7th Cir. 2001) (observing that “hybrid representation” by a represented party acting pro se and the party’s attorney “complicates and prolongs [proceedings], to the detriment of . . . the judicial system”). Morgan is represented by retained counsel and therefore the Court will not entertain pro se submissions from her. The Court concludes that the proper course is to order Document 91, Morgan’s purported motion, stricken from the docket of this case. *See United States v.*

Gwiazdzinski, 141 F.3d 784, 787 (7th Cir. 1998) (citing *Hayes v. Hawes*, 921 F.2d 100, 102 (7th Cir. 1990)) (ordering stricken from the record as being improperly before the court a pro se motion and brief filed by a defendant who was represented by counsel). Accordingly, the Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to strike Document 91 from the docket of this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: June 4, 2010

/s/ G. Patrick Murphy
G. PATRICK MURPHY
United States District Judge